

TWO VIENNA PAPYRI REVISED

During a recent visit to the Vienna Papyrussammlung I was allowed to check readings in two papyri, viz. SB VI 9153 and 9280, which for some reason had drawn my attention¹⁾. I should like to publish in this contribution a few suggestions for improved readings.

(a) SB VI 9153 (cf. already ZPE 24, 1977, 98):

The editor reads the dating formula in this papyrus as follows:

- 3 [Metd] τὴν ὑπατεῖαν τοῦ δ[ε]σποτοῦ ἡμῶν
- 4 καὶ σεβαστοῦ τοῦ θειοτάτου Φλ(αουλοῦ) Μαυρικίου
- 5 Τιβερίου ἔτους ιγ' θω[θ] .] ἀρχῇ τῆς [ἴνδ(ικτίωνος)]
- 6 εὐτυχῶς πεν[τε]καιδεκά[τ]ης ἐν Ἡρακλ(εοπόλει)

For this formula, cf. R.S.Bagnall - K.A.Worp, Regnal Formulas in Byzantine Egypt, 63 form.10 where it is indicated that according to Dr.Harrauer the numeral for the day in Thoth should be read as [1]7 or [2]7.

There are, however, a few elements in this formula which seem suspect:

1. In documents from later Byzantine Egypt the emperor is never styled σεβαστός. This epithet disappears from imperial titulature as found in the papyri after the start of the IVth century A.D.
2. The position of ἴνδ(ικτίωνος) restored in a supposed lacuna before the numeral belonging to this indiction seems very much questionable.

A check of the original papyrus revealed that the editor's transcript is not faultless: In fact, I read in line 4:

καὶ μεγίστου εὐεργέτου Φλ(αουλοῦ) Μαυρικίου.

In line 5, furthermore, there is absolutely no reason to suppose any part of the papyrus to have broken off at the end of the line, thus causing the loss of [ἴνδ(ικτίωνος)]; in line 6 the text should in my opinion be read as:

εὐτυχῶς πεν[τε]καιδεκά[τ]ης ἴνδ(ικτίωνος) ἐν Ἡρακλ(εοῦς πόλει).

As far as I am aware, the use of μέγιστος εὐεργέτης for Mauricius in documents from Herakleopolis is not earlier attested.

1) Once again Mssrs Dr.H.Harrauer, Director of the Vienna Papyrus collection, and Dr.J.M.Diethart have put me into their debt by their generous hospitality extended to me during my stay. I should like to thank them very much. Likewise, I should like to thank Dr.R.W.Daniel (Leiden) who read a first version of this article, corrected its English, and made some suggestions for its improvement.

The provenance of the boethos Ieremias is indicated in lines 12-13 as: ἀπ[ὸ τοῦ]]¹³ Ἰουσι[ιν]ης οἴκου ἐν τῇ [αὐ]τῇ Ἡρακλ(έους πόλει). In fact, however, the papyrus reads here: ἀπὸ Βουσίρεως οἴκων ἐν τῇ [αὐ]τῇ Ἡρακλ(έους πόλει), and this brings us toward a further correction in line 31 where we should read βοηθ(ός) Β[ο]υσίρεως rather than the editor's βοηθ(ός) οἴκου Σίρεως. The oikoi of Justine and of Siris can now be cancelled out of our documentation. }

(b) SB VI 9280 (cf. already ZPE 24, 1977, 100 n.27):

This papyrus concerns a loan of

- 9 νομισ[μά]τιον ἐν παρὰ κε-
 10 ράττια π[έν]τε, γίν(εται) νο[μισμά]τιον) [α] π(αρά) κερα(τία) ε
 11 κεφαλαίου ὄντα παρ' ἐμῇ
 12 εἰς τιμὴν σίτου τῇ φενο-
 13 μένῃ [τι]μὴν τῷ καιρῷ
 14 καὶ ἐκ π[ε]ριτ<τ>ο[ύ] τῆς τιμῆς
 15 σίτου ἀρτ[άβη]ν μίαν ἡμισυ
 16 ὅπερ σοι ἀπ[ο]δώσω, κτλ.

11 ὄντος, ἐμοί 12-13 τῇ φαινομένη τιμῇ τῇ

This is translated by the editor as "1 Gold-solidus weniger 5 Keratien als Kapitalgeld - - auf den Gegenwert von Getreide zu dem in der Lieferzeit geltenden (saisongemäßen) Preis und außer dem Getreidewert noch 1 1/2 Artaben, was ich dir liefern werde, usw."

Though the editor adduces a number of parallels which illustrate parts of this phrasing, the formula in its entirety is not normal. A check of the original revealed, moreover, that the papyrus has in fact in line 14 τρίτου instead of the editor's π[ε]ριτ<τ>ο[ύ]. Though this new reading does not make things at once crystal-clear, one is reminded of a similar passage in BGU XIII 2332.11-13 where a loan of 12,000 talents is described as:

ὄν[τα εἰς τ]ιμὴν σίνου ἐντο[πι]λου
 εὐαρέστου τῇ[ς ἐ]π[ὶ] τοῦ κερο[ύ] φανησομένης
 τιμῆς κουφιζομένων τὸν τρίτον (1. κουφιζομένης τῷ τρίτῳ)

Compare also BGU XIII 2339.11 where 6 1/2 1/8 artabs of wheat are given as κεφαλαίου ἐκ τρίτου, i.e. as principal + an interest at 50%. For this kind of stipulation see in general the discussion by R.S.Bagnall in GRBS 18, 1977, 85ff. who explains the situation in BGU XIII 2332 by pointing out that at the moment of repaying the debt in money by a delivery of wine 50% more wine will have to be delivered than would conform to normal market prices at the moment of repayment.

One may tackle the phrasing in SB VI 9280 along this same line, by as-

(Corrigenda
 2.P.E. 61/
 p. 92

suming that it was stipulated that the debt of 1 solidus minus 5 keratia would have to be defrayed by a repayment ^{of} wheat with a 50% premium in comparison with normal market prices for wheat at the moment of delivery. The scribe, who was not very competent, apparently garbled the formula by adding a completely redundant $\kappa\alpha\iota$ at the start of line 14 and by adding a superfluous text in line 15. It may be that the latter line was added, because the scribe wished to stress the stipulation that for each artab which should be delivered conform to normal market prices at the moment of repayment of the debt, in fact $1\frac{1}{2}$ artabs would have to be handed over. Such an explanation seems to agree more with general practices as found in such loan contracts than a stipulation according to which at the moment of repayment of a debt by the delivery of wheat the normal market price will be maintained + a premium of $1\frac{1}{2}$ artabs of wheat on top of this.

Amsterdam

Klaas A.Worp

SPIGOLATURE III*

Memorandum (Comparizione di sacerdoti?) - PUG inv.DR 59

Il frammento, recuperato da cartonnage, appartiene allo stesso lotto di documenti tolemaici recentemente acquistati dall'Istituto de Diritto Romano dell'Università di Genova, tra i quali resti di un'interessante titolatura sono stati già resi noti proprio su questa rivista¹⁾.

L'importanza del presente documento risiede nella menzione di sacerdoti oggetto di un verbo, ἀγαγεῖν, che, collocato da solo e all'inizio, può arricchire la generica definizione di Memorandum, con la precisazione di una "comparizione" (ἀγεῖν εἰς δίκην) in un qualche giudizio delle persone citate con patronimico e qualifica (ἱερεῖς Σούχου, παστοφόρον Ἴσιος).

Le persone elencate non sono note da altri documenti, ed arricchiscono, quindi, la prosopografia tolemaica in quell'importante sezione che è quella relativa al clero (Pros.Ptol.III). I nomi per altro sono assai comuni e ampiamente attestati nell'Arsinoites!

Per la datazione il ricorso al "criterio" paleografico è a questo punto obbligatorio: la forma caratteristica del ν e dell'ω ci indirizza a collocare il frammento negli anni 200-150 a.C.

La parte utilizzata per la scrittura è il recto secondo le fibre, il verso è bianco. Sulla sinistra si hanno resti di una kollesis.

Nomos Arsinoites

cm 12,8 x 9

200-150 a.C.

5B.8.	+	ἀγαγεῖν	Taf.VIa
13871		Ἀρσιήσιν Εἰς[ο]ύχ[ου]	
		καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ θ[ε]	
	4	Ἀρενταῖον ὄρου καὶ	
		Τοτοῖν Εἰσούχου καὶ	
		ὄρου Εἰσούχου οἱ τρεῖς	
		ἱερεῖς Σούχου καὶ	
	8	Πόρσην Ἀγχώφιος	

* Ringrazio i colleghi ed amici W.Clarysse, D.Hagedorn, P.J.Sijpesteijn per il generoso contributo della loro esperienza.

1) ZPE 49 (1982) 67-68; colgo ancora una volta l'occasione per rinnovare ai proff. M.Amelotti e L.Migliardi Zingale i miei ringraziamenti. Analoga la motivazione, immutabile la stima! - Al cit. frammento di titolatura ho potuto aggiungere un piccolo frustolo donatomi da H.Harrauer con una liberalità degna della migliore tradizione. Si completano però soltanto i primi 7 rigli della titolatura: purtroppo nella parte formulare e in quella prosopografica priva di problemi!